

demonstrate their fairness or their equity.

Last Thursday, in Boise, ID, Judge David Ezra, with a sweep of his pen, Mr. President, shut down 14 million acres in the State of Idaho. What does that mean? That means that in an area the size of Massachusetts and Connecticut and Maryland combined, this judge said, "Under the auspices of the Endangered Species Act, there will be no logging, no mining, no grazing, no road building or any human activity until the Forest Service can convince me and convince national marine fisheries that all of their activities fit within the confines of the Endangered Species Act," even if not one of those activities can scientifically be proven to harm a species of fish that is now listed as endangered within the watersheds of that region of the State of Idaho.

As a result of that, 56 timber stations, 82 mining operations, 3 road construction projects, and 395 livestock grazing operations—better known as ranches—have been told to cease and desist. Thousands of miners will be out of work as of Monday morning, next Monday morning, not because the mine played out, not because the market for minerals dropped, but because the Federal Government said you can no longer mine, and a Federal judge, again, said last Thursday, with the sweep of his pen, "Walk away. Pull your paycheck. We are not worried about your children and your homes and your families and your communities. We are worried that the law which is now clearly in question be complied with."

Well, Mr. President, you can well imagine, chaos reigns supreme in my State of Idaho at this moment; that in six of the eight Federal forests in my State, amassing over 14 million acres, all human activity, which is a major part of the economic base of that region of my State, has just been told to shut down, awaiting the action of a Federal bureaucracy that is now days behind in what it should have been doing days ago.

That is why it is so imperative that the Environment and Public Works Committee look at the reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act now—not next year, not 3 years from now, but now—to make sure that these kinds of silly bureaucratic activities can no longer go on and put the average man and woman and small business people in my State or any other State arbitrarily out of business.

We saw it go on in Oregon, with the spotted owl—30,000 loggers in the State of Oregon. Now, in my State of Idaho, thousands—yes, thousands—of people, small businesses that have existed in one family for over 100 years, are being threatened with their very existence.

It is clearly a call to arms. And I think the people of my State recognize that. It is clearly the responsibility of this Congress to change the law, to

make it more compatible, to make it more sensitive, to put the human species back into the blend of the Endangered Species Act so that we at least give some credence to the human species, that is the steward of the land, instead of arbitrarily saying to that human being—that mother, that father, that worker, that logger, that miner, that rancher, that small business person—"Step aside. You are no longer important. Step aside to a plant or an animal."

Since when did this Government become so insensitive to the rights of the human being? Since we have ignored our responsibilities to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act, and do these kinds of things that the American people finally in November of last year rose up and said to the Congress of the United States: "Become responsive to our needs or step aside and we will find somebody who will."

Well, I certainly hope this Senate recognizes that call and will become increasingly sensitive to their responsibility to the taxpayer, to the citizens, the law-abiding citizens, of our country.

Let us start with reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act, so that what is going on in Idaho today and next week and throughout this coming year, and what has gone on in the State of Oregon and other places around our country will not be repeated again; that we, as Senators, who agree to take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, will do that constitutional duty to put people back into the equation of being responsible for the stewards of our land.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1995

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, under the order entered last night, the Senate will convene at 9:30 a.m. on Monday, January 23, 1995.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Monday, the time for the two leaders be reserved and there then be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30, with Senators permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes each, with the exception of the following Senators: Senators GRASSLEY and PRYOR, for 15 minutes equally divided; Senator CONRAD, for up to 30 minutes. I further ask that at the hour of 10:30 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of S. 1, the unfunded mandates bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the only change I believe the Senator is making, so that we all understand it, instead of getting on S. 1 at 10 it will be at 10:30, and we are authorizing three Senators to

speak in that time. Instead of 10 it will be 10:30, so that our colleagues know.

Mr. CRAIG. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PREVENTING THE ADOPTION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL HISTORY STANDARDS

VIOLENCE AT CLINICS

IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to send to the desk three resolutions and that they be considered en bloc, agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

For the information of my colleagues, the three resolutions are the texts of the Gorton amendment, Bradley amendment and Boxer amendment that were offered to the unfunded mandates bill and voted on Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. And without objection, where appropriate, the preambles are agreed to.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I send the three resolutions to the desk.

So the resolutions (S. Res. 66, S. Res. 67, and S. Res. 68) were agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 66

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—(a) the National Education Goals Panel should disapprove, and the National Education Standards and Improvement Council should not certify, any voluntary national content standards, voluntary national student performance standards, or criteria for the certification of such content and student performance standards, on the subject of world and United States history, developed prior to February 1, 1995.

(b) voluntary national content standards, voluntary national student performance standards, and criteria for the certification of such content and student performance standards, on the subject of world and United States history, established under title II of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act should not be based on standards developed primarily by the National Center for History in the Schools prior to February 1, 1995; and

(c) if the Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, or any other Federal agency provides funds for the development of the standards and criteria described in paragraph (6) the recipient of such funds should have a decent respect for the contributions of western civilization, and United States history, ideas, and institutions, to the increase of freedom and prosperity around the world.

S. RES. 67

SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING PROTECTION OF REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CLINICS.

Whereas, there are approximately 900 clinics in the United States providing reproduction health services;

Whereas, violence directed at persons seeking to provide reproductive health services continues to increase in the United States, as demonstrated by the recent shootings at two reproductive health clinics in Massachusetts and another health care clinic in Virginia;

Whereas, organizations monitoring clinic violence have recorded over 130 incidents of violence or harassment directed at reproductive health care clinics and their personnel in 1994 such as death threats, stalking, chemical attacks, bombings and arson;

Whereas, there has been one attempted murder in Florida and four individuals killed at reproductive health care clinics in Florida and Massachusetts in 1994;

Whereas, the Congress passed and the President signed the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act of 1994, a law establishing Federal criminal penalties and civil remedies for certain violent, threatening, obstructive and destructive conduct that is intended to injure, intimidate or interfere with persons seeking to obtain or provide reproductive health services;

Whereas, violence is not a mode of free speech and should not be condoned as a method of expressing an opinion; and

Whereas, the President has intrusted the Attorney General to order—

“(A) the United States Attorneys to create task forces of Federal, State and local law enforcement officials and develop plans to address security for reproductive health care clinics located within their jurisdictions; and

“(B) the United States Marshals Service to ensure coordination between clinics and Federal, State and local law enforcement officials regarding potential threats of violence: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States Attorney General should fully enforce the law and protect persons seeking to provide or obtain, or assist in providing or obtaining, reproductive health services from violent attack.

(c) Nothing in this resolution shall be construed to prohibit any expressive conduct (including peaceful picketing or other peaceful demonstration) protected from legal prohibition by the first amendment to the constitution.

—
S. RES. 68**IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**

Whereas, the Congress should be concerned about shifting costs from Federal to State and local authorities and should be equally concerned about the growing tendency of States to shift costs to local governments;

Whereas, cost shifting from States to local governments has, in many instances, forced local governments to raise property taxes or curtail sometimes essential services; and

Whereas, increases in local property taxes and cuts in essential services threaten the ability of many citizens to attain and main-

tain the American dream of owning a home in a safe, secure community: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that

(1) the Federal Government should not shift certain costs to the State, and States should end the practice of shifting costs to local governments, which forces many local governments to increase property taxes;

(2) States should end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by their legislatures, of State issued mandates on local governments without adequate State funding, in a manner that may displace other essential government priorities; and

(3) one primary objective of this Act and other efforts to change the relationship among Federal, State, and local governments should be to reduce taxes and spending at all levels and to end the practice of shifting costs from one level of government to another with little or no benefit to taxpayers.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1995 AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:35 p.m., recessed until Monday, January 23, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.